

## REMARKS

The acknowledgment of the claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §119 is noted with appreciation. With regard to receipt of the priority documents, once again, Applicant submitted the certified copies of the priority documents in their entirety (*i.e.*, the certification cover pages along with the priority documents in their original language) with the paper entitled “Submission of Priority Documents” on July 14, 2004. Based on the above, it appears that the certified copies in their entirety were inadvertently misplaced at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO). However, as the Examiner has acknowledged receipt of some of the documents, and if the priority document cannot be found at the USPTO, the Applicant will submit a second copy of the priority documents upon allowance of this application.

With regard to the abstract, please note that Applicant submitted an abstract rewritten into a single paragraph with the response filed February 28, 2005 per the Examiner’s request (see 5 of the February 28, 2005 response). However, for the sake of completeness, the abstract of the disclosure has been rewritten to contain a single paragraph as required by the Examiner (see above). No new matter has been introduced.

The Examiner has not provided a formal acceptance of the amended formal drawings filed with the response of February 28, 2005. The undersigned requests a formal acceptance of the drawings with the next communication.

Claims 1-3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,586,695 to Sato et al. Claims 4, 6 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Sato et al. For the sake of simplifying prosecution in the case, claims 4, 6, and 7 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. The applicant traverses the sole rejection remaining, and notes that claims 1-3 are not anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,586,695 to Sabo, and also notes that these claims are not obvious over Sabo either.

Sato discloses a key switch device designed specifically to prevent separation of the first and second links. Particularly, when the key top (2) is pulled up, it is removed along with a pair of link members which facilitates reassembling (see column 2, lines 8-24, in Sato).

The Examiner has suggested that Sato also teaches a stopper portion on the frame that, when in contact with a second end of a link, positions the link at an assembling position (see page 3 of the Office Action). This conclusion is in error. Sato fails to teach, suggest or recognize the importance of having a stopper on the frame that contacts with a second end portion of a link in order to automatically align the link with a key top (as is required by claim 1). The Examiner has cited element 30 of Sato as showing a second end portion. This is simply not correct. As shown in Figures 5A-C, Sato shows a restricting projection 30 of the link 4 that is guided along the convex portion of the restricting surface 31A of a wall member 31. It is self-evident from Figures 5A-C in Sato that the restricting projection 30 is not at either end portion of the link 4. Rather, the restricting projection 30 is located between the end portions of the link, as can be clearly shown in Figure 5A in Sato. Moreover, the restricting projection does not function to align the link with a key top. Rather, the restricting projection 30 and restricting surface 31A in Sato provides a completely different function than the second end portion of the arm and stopper of the present invention. Specifically, Sato at column 12, lines 3-8, teaches the restricting projection 30 to be guided along the convex portion of the curved restricting surface 31A in order to restrict horizontal movement of the key top 2. Conversely, the present invention teaches the use of a stopper 17 with an inclined surface 17a that allows the automatic alignment of the link 13 to the key top 18 (see page 12 of the specification and Figures 9 and 10). Sato clearly fails to teach or suggest automatic alignment between a link and a key top.

For the aforementioned reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-3 are not anticipated by Sato, and that one of ordinary skill in the art would not find it obvious to create the present invention set forth in claims 1-3 by consulting Sato.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered, that claims 1-3 be allowed, and that the application be passed to issue.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

A provisional petition is hereby made for any extension of time necessary for the

Serial No.: 10/796,119

T. Sato

Page 6

continued pendency during the life of this application. Please charge any fees for such provisional petition and any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-2041.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael E. Whitham  
Reg. No. 32,635

Whitham, Curtis & Christofferson, P. C.  
11491 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 340  
Reston, Virginia 20190  
Customer Number: 30743  
(703) 787-9400 Kenneth L. Bonner, Sr.  
11101 Wedge Drive  
Reston, Virginia 20190